



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

W
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/715,803	11/18/2003	Paul R. Meernik	GP-303124	5204
7590	06/27/2006		EXAMINER	
KATHRYN A. MARRA General Motors Corporation Legal Staff, Mail Code 482-C23-B21 P.O. Box 300 Detroit, MI 48265-3000			KING, BRADLEY T	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	3683
DATE MAILED: 06/27/2006				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/715,803	MEERNIK, PAUL R.	
	Examiner Bradley T. King	Art Unit 3683	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 April 2006.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-4,7-12 and 23-27 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-4,7-12 and 23-27 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 1/05/2006 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-4, 8-9, 12 and 23-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Isaacson (US#3788626).

Isaacson discloses all the limitations of the instant claims including: a housing 10; a load initiating element 46 located within the housing; a spring 37 located adjacent to the load initiating element, and configured to expand in compression against the housing; and a compression member 20 and/or 24 slideably disposed within the housing and configured to compress the spring from a side opposite the load initiating element 46; wherein the load initiating element, spring and compression member are

slideable within the housing in a first axial direction and in a second opposite axial direction in response to an axial load on the load initiating element, and lockable within the housing in the second axial direction in response to an axial load on the compression member in the second axial direction. Note that an axial load which removes the preload created by the load initiating element 46 allows movement of the entire assembly in either direction.

Regarding claim 3, an inner tube 20 is slideably positioned within the outer tube.

Regarding claim 12, see figure 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 10-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Isaacson (US#3788626).

Isaacson discloses all the limitations of the instant claims with exception to a plurality of springs. It is well known in the art to substitute a plurality of springs in place of one to provide proper spring length and characteristics without undue cost. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize multiple springs in the device of Isaacson to provide adequate damping forces in an economical fashion. Also note, *In re Harza*, 274 F.2d 669, 124 USPQ 378 (CCPA 1960) for further support regarding the obviousness of duplication of parts.

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Isaacson (US#3788626) in view of Brock et al (US# 2003/0000793).

Isaacson discloses all the limitations of the instant claims with exception to the disclosure of a wave spring, instead showing a conical elastomeric spring. Wave spring, conical springs and elastomeric springs are well known in the art for providing biasing forces. Brock et al disclose a brake device and further demonstrate the interchangeability of the above mentioned springs. Note figures 7a-d. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize a wave spring in the device of Isaacson as an obvious art recognized alternative structure such as demonstrated by Brock et al.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 1/5/06 and 4/20/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants arguments with regards to Richards are persuasive.

Regarding Isaacson, it is maintained that the reference shows load initiating element 46 in contact with the inner surface of the housing 10. Some degree of frictional force inherently exists between the spring and the housing due to the physical contact between the two parts. It is maintained that the rejections are proper.

Conclusion

Art Unit: 3683

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bradley T. King whose telephone number is (571) 272-7117. The examiner can normally be reached on 11:00-7:30 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James McClellan can be reached on (571) 272-6786. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

BTK



BRADLEY KING
PATENT EXAMINER